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**Reviewer's report:**

**GENERAL COMMENTS**

1. The Abstract is clear and concise, highlighting the relevant content of the paper.

2. The Methods used seem appropriate. However, owing to a lack of experience with statistical analysis, I cannot confidently comment on the use of specific tests, nor on their interpretation. The comments in the paper are made on the assumption that the statistics are accurate.

3. The Results are clearly laid out.

4. The Discussion clearly demonstrates how the author has viewed the results of this study in the broader context of the literature in this domain.

5. The References are appropriate and consistently formatted.

6. This paper makes an interesting contribution to the body of knowledge. It is well-written and therefore easy to read. However, the use of perceived knowledge and attitudes offers little in the way of robust evidence that can be generalised to more diverse populations. While this may not have been the point of the study, it does impact on its usefulness to an international audience. In addition, the evidence makes it difficult to offer strong recommendations because of the small sample size and self-reported nature of the responses. This doesn't make it a bad study, only that it's difficult to use it to justify any changes in teaching practice.

**MINOR ESSENTIAL REVISIONS**

1. Abstract (Methods): insert space before "Sympathy"

2. Method: The Method section would benefit from a more detailed description of the questionnaire, especially in terms of the types of questions asked. This would help prepare the reader for sections of the Discussion.

3. Discussion (EBP domains / Terminology): Try to differentiate between actual knowledge and perceived knowledge. Since you didn't test knowledge or understanding you are relying on what participants reported. This makes statements like "...feel increasingly knowledgeable..." somewhat dubious. While this objection is addressed well in the study Limitations, there are sections in the
Discussion in which the distinction isn't clear.

Conclusion: I think that the paper would be of more interest if you made specific recommendations for the future integration of EBP into the undergraduate curriculum. The findings of the study have implications for our understanding of how new graduates use / don't use their knowledge of EBP in the real world. I think that this is important to highlight for healthcare educators who are currently engaged in teaching EBP and the Conclusion as it stands doesn't go far enough in terms of making recommendations for changing teaching practice.

Table 1: it is unclear why there are 2 columns for "Critical appraisal"

**Level of interest:** An article of limited interest

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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